



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

help of magic or knightly adventure, but by a lucky chance: the conclusion turns upon a sleepy escort and a horse's eagerness for his stable."

While as a general thing a complete translation of the works of some one author is perhaps a more valuable contribution to literature than a group of selections from different authors, the number of translations from the Old French is so limited that this book will do a real service in rendering a few additional specimens accessible to those readers who have not been initiated into the Old French through the study of linguistics.

The typographical appearance of the work is excellent, the thick paper, large print and Old English titles have their share in the pleasant impression made by the book.

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE JONES.

University of Illinois.

BEOWULF, edited with introduction, bibliography, notes, glossary, and appendices, by W. J. Sedgefield, Litt. D., Manchester University Press, 1910.

This new edition of *Beowulf*, with introduction and critical apparatus in English, is sure to receive a hearty welcome in the United States, as well as in England. To the teacher, in particular, such a volume may well prove very useful, since, even for advanced students, there are some advantages to be derived from using an English rather than a foreign edition of the poem. A certain amount of time is thus saved, even with classes who read German with a fair degree of ease. And there is, at the present time, no English text which at all fills the place of the Heyne-Socin edition, as revised by Schücking. Wyatt's volume, admirable as it is in many ways, certainly leaves a good deal to be desired, partly through its compression and brevity, and partly for other reasons, which need not here be set forth. The Harrison and Sharp version of the Heyne-Socin text is, of course, entirely out of date. Klaeber's work is still in preparation. The time is ripe, then, for such a volume as this, and one opens it with the hope of finding it an acceptable substitute for the best foreign editions.

To say that this hope has scarcely been realized is not to deny the many excellences which the book contains. For the devotion and the care which have gone to its making, we should give Dr. Sedgefield the fullest recognition. The preparation of such a piece of work as this single-handed, as we are told was the case in the present instance, involves prolonged and tedious labor, and requires a mastery of a wide range of philological learn-

ing,—linguistic, metrical and literary. The mass of books, monographs, periodical articles and dissertations, which deal with the subject is truly bewildering. Under these circumstances, no one will be unduly severe for sins of omission or of commission. It seems best, however, to point out in some detail the errors which the volume undoubtedly contains, and to attempt a frank estimate of its usefulness as a guide to students. Such criticisms might be of service in preparing a second edition, which would surely result in many improvements. The following remarks are in part the result of actual experience in using this text as supplementary to a university course in the reading and criticism of the poem.

Perhaps the best part of the book is the text, which is a genuine contribution to "Beowulf" literature. It has involved, so the editor tells us, "more arduous labor than perhaps any other part of the book." Based on actual consultation of the manuscript, and with due regard for the Thorkelin transcription, and that made at Thorkelin's order, it registers, by means of a very careful and consistent system of round and square brackets and notes at the bottom of the page, the precise facts in regard to the various readings noted. The true situation in regard to the text of a given passage thus lies before the reader at a glance. This arrangement is far more convenient than Schücking's, which necessitates, even in the ninth edition, a somewhat tedious consultation of the annotations at the end, in order to discover the reading of the manuscript, and the source of the emendations. Less admirable seems the decision to omit all marks of quantity from the text, even in cases where they appear in the manuscript. What useful purpose is served by omitting them? If an absolutely literal copy of the manuscript were being made, the situation would be different, but if punctuation and capitalization are added, and the whole is arranged as poetry and divided to show paragraph-structure, why should not the quantities be inserted? At all events, why relegate the indications actually found in the manuscript to a list at the end of the book? It will be noted that the glossary indicates the length of the vowels, under the head-words. Upon this whole question, of course, opinions must differ; and it is in no sense a reproach to the work that this particular method has been followed. It would be convenient to have the *fytt*-divisions in the manuscript, bad as they are, indicated at the side of the text, rather than in an appendix at the end. The inclusion of the texts of "Widsith," "Waldhere" and "Deor" is an admirable idea. These pieces throw a great deal of light on the poem in a variety of ways. The editor's brief comment (p. 28), however, should be rephrased. "Deor" is certainly not a "fragment of the Old English epic," if indeed it is properly to be termed a "heroic lay" at all, and it is of

quite a different character from "Waldhere" and "The Battle of Maldon."

The editor has sometimes been pretty free with his conjectural emendations. Here again opinions must differ in regard to the best method of procedure, yet it seems better to err on the side of conservatism. Wherever a passage is metrically sound, and not hopelessly ungrammatical, it is surely wise to let it alone. Why, for example, should MS. *eazle* 1537, be emended to *feaze*?—a change not due in the beginning to the present editor. Again, it is dangerous to attempt to improve the poem stylistically, as in 642ff., in regard to which the editor says, "On the whole it seems best to transpose the half-lines, as in the text, and translate, 'Then once more as of old, the people were joyous; fine words were spoken, the sounds of victorious men.' (p. 158.) This rearrangement of the sequence of thought in accordance with modern preferences for logical progression does violence to a characteristic peculiarity of Anglo-Saxon poetic style, the interlocking of ideas in the sequence ABAB, etc. The editor shows forgetfulness of this peculiarity also in his note to l. 208, where he argues against a certain rendering because "it would be a repetition." Another instance of conjectural emendation of doubtful wisdom is found in l. 1107, where the puzzling phrase *icge gold* is altered to *andiege gold*. The word *andiege* is found nowhere else, so far as my knowledge extends, and its meaning is almost as obscure as that of the word it replaces. On the other hand, the suggested transposition of *under heofones hador* to *hador under heofone* is ingenious, and thoroughly in accord with Anglo-Saxon idiom.

A certain number of misprints are bound to occur in any text, especially in a first edition. Of these the following have been noted:—880, *golde* for *wolde*; 1069, sentence should begin with a capital letter; 111, no capital for *panon*; 1488, comma instead of period at end of line; 1664, read *pat* for *pa*; 2276, read *par* for *pa*; 1767, read *semninga* for *semminga*; 1865, period at the end of the line; 1912, read *næssas* for *mæssas*; 2320, read *dryhtsele* for *rhyhtsele*; 2168, read *dyrnun* for *drynum*; 3171, read *hie* (?) for *ho*; "Waldere" 18, read *symle* for *smyle*.

The difficult task of providing a suitable glossary has been well done. It is much fuller than Wyatt's, and the general scheme is excellent. The stems of nouns and the classes of strong verbs are indicated, which is a convenience for the more elementary student. The editor informs us that the glossary was first prepared independently, and then compared with the glossaries of Holthausen, Schücking, and Holder. A few misprints and omissions may be mentioned. The reader is referred under *ægweard* to *iegweard*, which is not to be found; the word

wilcuma, though correctly registered as wk. masc., is glossed "welcome," rather than "the welcome one;" the meaning of the word *sar* is omitted; and under *eaforheafodsegn* the reader is referred to *eafor* instead of to *eofor*.

The Glossary of Proper Names shows an instance or two of questionable editorial judgment. Möller's version of the Finn-episode is followed as the better,—a view which will hardly commend itself to modern students of the Episode and Fragment. For an exhaustive discussion of the location of the Geats, the reader is referred to Ten Brink's "Beowulf." A much better reference would be Schück's *Folkenamnet Geatas*, etc., which is registered in the bibliography earlier in the book. Ten Brink's work here is out of date, and less valuable than Schück's. Under *Brosinga* we are told that the necklace, the *Brisinga men*, "was supposed to have come ultimately into the possession of the Brisings." But it was the Brisings, the drawfs, "weavers," who made it in the beginning.

The Notes appear to the present reviewer hardly adequate. It is, of course, difficult to decide what to put in, and what to leave out, in the face of such a mass of exegesis as has accumulated about "Beowulf." But these notes hardly fulfil the editor's promise to include "what is essential to the understanding of the text," and important difficulties are sometimes treated in anything but a satisfactory way. For example, consider the comments on the passage beginning *mod þrypo wæg* 1931. Sedgefield reads *Modþrype wæg*, taking *mōðþryp*=*pride*. But in his note he seems to be following the other interpretation, which makes *þryp* a proper name, as he refers to "the transition between Hygd and the bad queen." But how is the student to know that there is any transition, or indeed any bad queen? If no proper name is assumed in l. 1931, the lines following can hardly refer to any one but Hygd,—the older view, now obsolete. It is hard, indeed, to gather what Sedgefield's conception of the passage really is, and if it is difficult for the investigator, who is familiar with critical comments, it is sure to be doubly so for the student who is ignorant of them. Furthermore, Sedgefield's statement that "*þryp* has been shown to be impossible as a proper name" needs further qualification or explanation; it might easily mislead the reader into inferring that the proper name *þryp* is an impossible form.

Some of the statements in the notes which seem to be open to criticism are here noted.

7. William of Malmesbury and Æthelweard tell the story of the child floating to a foreign land not of Scyld but of Sceaf. Whether Scefing means "son of the sheaf" in this passage is a matter of dispute, cf. Olrik, "Heltedigtning," I, 233ff.

62. The most convincing reading of the line, *paet Sigeneow wæs Sæwelan cwen*, adopted by Holthausen and Schücking, is not mentioned, either in the notes or in the textual annotations at the foot of the page.

73. *buton folcscare ond feorum gumena*. Sedgefield says "The king could not alienate the tribal land (*folcscaru*), nor could he on his own responsibility deprive one of the tribesmen of life." But *feorum gumena* refers rather to the ransoms paid for men of the tribe. The interpretation given by Sedgefield, even if admissible on other grounds, does not accord with *eall gedælan*, etc.

87. *þrage* is said to mean "an unhappy time." Why? Does it really mean any more than "a space of time"?

140. *burum*, "perhaps sleeping-recesses along the sides of the hall." This cannot mean inside the hall, of course,—the warriors sought other quarters on account of the dangers of the hall itself. Is there any evidence that the "bowers" lined the hall on the outside?

223. Is *eoletes* best taken as nominative? The word is otherwise unknown, but the chances seem wholly in favor of its being a genitive, since it ends in *es*.

236. Does the first element of *mepelwordum* add nothing to the meaning of the second element? Does it not convey the idea of *formal* address?

420. Who is "Binns"?

568. Is there any reason why *brontne* may not be used of the sea?—cf. the modern phrase "the high seas." And is it possible to take *brontne* as "the tall ones," hence "ships"? It will be noted, in considering the merits of Sedgefield's explanation, that it involves emending *ford* to *forþ*.

769. Sedgefield here reads *ealuscerpen*, following "Andreas" 1526, and taking *scerpen* as a substantive connected with the adjective *scearp*, and meaning "an acrid or burning sensation"; and *ealuscerpen* "heartburn" or "indigestion," or perhaps even "vomiting!" The references to the Bosworth-Toller "Lexicon" do not provide much support for this interpretation. If it is right, let us hope that the digestive disturbances will not be too literally set forth in future translations. The rendering of von Grienberger seems preferable, however,—"*Gährung*," hence "*Erregung, Aufruhr*."

785. "*wealle* is the town wall." Or it may be the wall of Heorot, from whence the noise proceeds.

1005. *genyðde* is singular, not plural, as is shown by the sing. verb *sceal*, and the phrase *his lichoma*, etc., following. It seems better not to make it refer to *stowe*, as Schücking does, since it is the man, and not the grave, that is "forced by necessity."

1056. "Most edds. take *wyrd* as acc. s., but a man's destiny could not be hindered, as we see from l. 455, *gaep a wyrd swa hio scel*." Of course it is impossible to reconcile the Christian and the heathen conceptions in the poem; the point here is that the Christian God is powerful enough to avert the course of Fate. Cf. l. 477.

1240. "*sum*, sing. for plur., 'some,' 'more than one.'" Not at all; this refers to Aeschere,—cf. l. 1251 *sum sare angeald*, etc., and l. 1294ff.

1340. *feor* may be positive adv., not to be interpreted as "too far, excessively."

1691. *frecne geferdon* may mean "they behaved impiously," as well as "they had a fearful experience."

3014. "the subject of *gebrohte* is *he* (Beowulf) understood." Read *gebohte*, not *gebrohte*. It may well be the plu. of the past participle agreeing with *beagas*, instead of pret. 3sg. The construction is smoother if it is taken in this way.

In the bibliography p. 33, read Chauncey B. Tinker instead of Chas. and Chas. B. (ll. 1 and 15). Some additions and omissions might be suggested; such an indifferent piece of work as Kistenmacher's "Wortliche Wiederholungen" is registered, but not W. M. Hart's "Ballad and Epic," one of the best of all discussions of the style of "Beowulf." Chadwick's "Origins of the English Nation" should surely be included in the bibliography.

We now come to the Introduction, which will be read with especial interest, since there is at the present time no adequate discussion in English of the origin and development of the poem to which the student may be referred. A considerable part of the Introduction deals with purely formal description, of course, and with this there is little fault to be found, except certain remarks on metrics. The student might well conclude, from the information on p. 6, that Möller's strophic hypothesis deserves acceptance, and that Sievers' criticism of this was mistaken. The beginner should be told that the strophic theory, as Möller proposed it, is as dead as a door-nail at the present day. On the other hand, it is not quite correct to say that Sievers "denies the existence of the stroph in Old English verse of any period;" cf. his "Altgermanische Metrik," p. 145. The latter part of the Introduction contains much which demands adverse comment. On p. 16, Müllenhoff's and ten Brink's theories of the composition of the poem are set forth, but a clear idea is not given of the probable process of growth if the *Liedertheorie* be rejected. On p. 18 the name of Hygelac as it occurs in Gregory of Tours is misspelled, the form corresponding to none of the variants. (See Förster, *Materialien*, p. 6.)—Such a statement as this is confusing, "The name Beowulf has by some been identified with

the *Bíar* of Icelandic saga." By whom? And does Sedgefield refer to the occurrence of the name *Bíar* in the "*Kalfsvísa*?" There is no such definite Scandinavian hero as Sedgefield seems to imply.—In regard to the "*Grettissaga*," we are told that "*Grettir*'s followers, seated on the bank above, await his return." The "followers" consist of one priest, who leaves before *Grettir* comes out of the waterfall. Why should such a ludicrously outworn statement as *Ettmüller*'s that "one primitive nation never borrows the heroic sagas of another" be perpetuated?—The summary of *Sarrazin*'s "*Beowulf-Studien*" on p. 22 restates various theories which are either doubtful or obsolete. *Sarrazin* has done a great service to *Beowulf*-criticism, but everyone knows that the 1888 volume of "*Studien*" is now in many respects out of date,—a fact which *Sarrazin* himself would probably be the first to confess. But Sedgefield still seems to pin his faith to this book, although he does say that "no doubt *Sarrazin* goes farther than most can follow him when he claims the authorship of the *Beowulf* for *Cynewulf*." The researches of *Morsbach* and others into the language make still more improbable than ever the *Cynewulf*-theory. If the poem was written between 700 and 720 or 730 how can *Cynewulf* have had any thing to do with it, unless we put him entirely out of his usual position? Sedgefield discusses the "identification" of *Beowulf* with *Böþvarr Bjarki*, but he leaves us in some doubt as to just what he means by the word. Of course *Sarrazin*'s equation *Beowulf*=*Böþvarr* is inadmissible. Similarly, the word "mythical" needs more precise definition on pp. 23 and 26. *Sarrazin*'s notion of a *Balder*-myth underlying *Beowulf* does not command much assent at the present day, even from those who believe in mythological theories. The reference to *Möller*'s strophic theory as supporting the arguments of *Sarrazin* is unfortunate, for reasons already given. Sedgefield notes that it is "considerably weakened" by the criticisms of *Sievers*, but it should have no place at all in such a brief analysis as is here given. The reference to *Hrólfr* as "*Hrólfr Kraka*" (p. 22) shows forgetfulness of the fact that *Kraka* is genitive.—The good old arguments for the "*Beowa*-myth" are set forth on p. 24, and the editor comes to the conclusion that "the case for translation or adaptation of a Scandinavian poem is not proved, as the tone of *Beowulf* is essentially English."

This is no place to enter upon a discussion of the difficult question of the origins and the development of "*Beowulf*." The editor has read *Panzer*'s book, and he rejects the results there reached, and cleaves rather to the old *Müllenhoffian* hypothesis, in a modified form. His analysis does not provide a clear and up-to-date statement of the older theory, such as may be found in *Bradley*'s article on "*Beowulf*" in the eleventh edition of the

"Encyclopedia Britannica." His whole discussion reveals lack of a really comprehensive acquaintance with the problem, and a singular failure to discriminate between the true and the false, especially a failure to reject from a chapter intended as an introduction for students theories and conclusions which have long since been weighed in the balance and found wanting. These matters are indeed exceedingly difficult to control, but they deserve as much attention in such a volume as this as the establishment of a text or the preparation of a glossary.

In spite of these shortcomings, this new edition of "Beowulf" will fill a useful place, and, let us hope, will soon appear in a revised form, in which, freed from some of the inevitable errors which creep into the first printing of such a text, it will surely be of much service to future students of the poem.

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.

Columbia University.

THE OLD ENGLISH CHRISTIAN EPIC. A STUDY IN THE PLOT TECHNIQUE OF THE JULIANA, THE ELENE, THE ANDREAS, AND THE CHRIST, IN COMPARISON WITH THE BEOWULF AND WITH THE LATIN LITERATURE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. By George Arnold Smithson. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 303-400, September 30, 1910. Berkeley. The University Press. \$1.00.

In addition to furnishing an analysis of the plot characteristics of the Old English Christian epic, Dr. Smithson's study attacks the following problems: (1) the relation of the narrative art of the later group of poems to the narrative art of the *Beowulf*; (2) the influence of Latin literature on the narrative art of the Christian epics; (3) the comparative value of the poems of the group; and (4) the authorship of the *Andreas*.

So far as the first problem is concerned, the dissertation is a continuation of Professor Hart's study of the development of narrative art in *Ballad and Epic* (Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, vol. xi). Dr. Smithson finds the Christian epic to be, in the main, another stage in the natural development traced by Professor Hart from simple ballads to the pagan epic *Beowulf*. A method differing somewhat from that of *Ballad and Epic* has been used, and the analysis does not show the thoroughness and elaboration which give weight to the conclusions of Professor Hart.